

ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. CR 08-637

JESSIE EARL HILL, III
Appellant

v.

STATE OF ARKANSAS
Appellee

Opinion Delivered March 12, 2009

PRO SE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR ARREST OF JUDGMENT AND TO ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT; PRO SE REPLY BRIEF, MOTION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND MOTION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION [CIRCUIT COURT OF OUACHITA COUNTY, CR 95-156, HON. CAROL C. ANTHONY, JUDGE]

MOTIONS TREATED AS MOTION FOR REHEARING AND DENIED.

PER CURIAM

On January 30, 2009, this court handed down *Hill v. State*, CR 08-637 (Ark. Jan. 30, 2009) (per curiam), in which we affirmed the trial court’s ruling that denied criminal postconviction relief to appellant Jessie Earl Hill, III.¹ Now before us is appellant’s pro se motion for reconsideration of that decision. The motion also seeks the arrest and either the alteration or amendment of the underlying criminal judgment of conviction. Appellant has also filed a pleading captioned as a pro se “reply brief, motion for writ of mandamus and motion for writ of prohibition.” Although so captioned, the pleading was intended to be a supplemental motion for reconsideration. We treat the motions for reconsideration and other relief as a motion for rehearing pursuant to Arkansas Supreme

¹In our prior decision, we additionally held that appellant’s pro se motions for appointment of counsel and to file an enlarged brief were moot and denied appellant’s pro se motions to supplement the addendum and for an oral argument.

Court Rule 2-3.

Appellant has failed to meet his burden of demonstrating that there was some error of fact or law in the decision that would merit a rehearing required by Rule 2-3. In the instant motion, appellant reiterates the same grounds advanced in the appeal from the trial court's decision, and again recites the underlying facts that he contends will support his claim of innocence. A petition for rehearing is not intended to allow the petitioner to merely repeat the arguments already made to the court. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 2-3(g).

In addition, appellant raises new contentions, including the alleged existence of a plot in which he was supposed to be ambushed and murdered, and the failure of the police officers' probable cause affidavits to prove his guilt. New arguments will not be considered in a petition for rehearing. *Pannell v. State*, 320 Ark. 390, 897 S.W.2d 552 (1995).

Motions treated as motion for rehearing and denied.